

## Interview Summary

**Application**

09/542,714

**Applicant(s)**

HAVEMOSE, ALLAN

**Examiner**

Tuan A Vu

**Art Unit**

2124

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A Vu.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Malinowski ( reg # 43423).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 21 November 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 7, 13 and 18.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner has sought to see if applicants could modify the independent claims so to clarify the position of the last limitation in the body of the claims and to modify the claiming of such limitation as to make the claims distinguishable over the prior art. It turned out that there were no agreed upon terms under which the claims could be modified to reflect how this limitation in conjunction with the upper part of the claims can overcome the prior art; and the issue remain unresolved. Hence, Examiner notified Applicants that a rejection would be prepared and sent in view of the observations made by Applicant in the Appeal brief.